

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Upon entry of the present Response, claims 1 and 14 will be amended. Entry of the present Response, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the pending application in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In this regard, the Examiner asserted that there was insufficient antecedent basis for the terminology “the size” in claims 1 and 14.

Upon entry of the present Response, claims 1 and 14 will be amended to replace the terminology “the size” with “a size”. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph rejection.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vercellotti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,266,925). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants’ claim 1 recites a method for multi-reading a plurality of IDs, by which an interrogator and multiple transponders repeat queries and responses therebetween. The method includes specifying, by the interrogator, a first read range of IDs in a first query, and if the interrogator does not receive a response to the first query, or receives only a single response to the first query, transmitting, by the interrogator, a second query specifying a second read range of IDs which is twice a size of the first read range of IDs.

Applicants' independent claim 14 recites a method for multi-reading a plurality of IDs, by which an interrogator and multiple transponders repeat queries and responses there-between. The method includes specifying, by the interrogator, a first read range of IDs in a first query, and if the interrogator does not receive a response to the first query, or if the interrogator receives a response to the first query and the first read range includes a single ID, transmitting, by the interrogator, a second query specifying a second read range of IDs which is twice a size of the first read range of IDs.

Vercellotti et al. discloses an interrogation method which is performed between an interrogator 26 and tags 28. The interrogator 26 sends a request for all tags 28 to look at their identification numbers, and if the tag identification number is greater than a requested address A from the interrogator 26, the tag replies.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Vercellotti's interrogation method includes specifying, by the interrogator 26, a first read range of IDs in a first query. The Examiner acknowledges that Vercellotti's disclosed interrogation method does not include transmitting, by the interrogator 26, a second query specifying a second read range of IDs which is twice a size of the first read range of IDs, if the interrogator 26 does not receive a response to the first query, or receives only a single response to the first query. However, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to expand the read range of the tag identification numbers to twice a size of the interrogation tag address A because increasing the size two-fold would improve a number of processes and reduce interrogations.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no basis for the Examiner's assertion that expanding Vercellotti's read range to twice its size would improve the number of

processes and reduce interrogations. Rather, Applicants submit that this assertion is merely conclusory, and not supported by objective evidence.

Vercellotti et al. discloses that, if the interrogator 26 does not receive any replies to an interrogation signal, the interrogation address A is merely decremented by $2^{(m-j)}$ (where 2^m is the number of tags, and j is an index). See e.g., col. 4, lines 28-36 of Vercellotti et al. In other words, the read range increases by $2^{(m-j)}$ tags. If the interrogator 26 receives only a single reply to the interrogation signal, the interrogator merely instructs the replying tag not to respond to further interrogations, and does not change the interrogation address. See, e.g., col. 4, lines 10-18 of Vercellotti et al.

The Examiner has not cited any evidence that a number of processes would be improved, or that interrogations would be reduced, if Vercellotti's interrogation method were to be changed by increasing the read range by twice its size, instead of increasing the range by $2^{(m-j)}$ tags, when no replies to the interrogation signal are received. Thus, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not articulated a proper rationale for why the claimed inventions would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the inventions.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections, and allow claims 1 and 14.

Applicant submit that claims 2-13 are also in condition for allowance, in view of their dependency from claims 1 and 14.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants recognize that the current status of the present application is after-Final. However, Applicants submit that entry of the present Response is proper under the current circumstances, as the present Response does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. In this regard, the amendments in the present Response to claims 1 and 14 merely correct antecedent basis issues raised by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and believed to be appropriate. Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present invention in condition for allowance and believe that they have done so.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Takashi TANAKA et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

James K. Moore, Jr.
Reg. No. 56,272

February 19, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191